

GLENN JOHNSON, PhD, Volume II, 2-25-09

Page 286

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his)
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL)
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and)
OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE)
ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
in his capacity as the)
TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) 4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al,)
Defendants.)

VOLUME II OF THE VIDEOTAPED
DEPOSITION OF GLENN JOHNSON, PhD, produced as a
witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above
styled and numbered cause, taken on the 25th day of
February, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of
Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A.
Steinmeyer, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly
certified under and by virtue of the laws of the
State of Oklahoma.

TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS
918-587-2878

394d5884-b3f1-4f89-b34a-87b0d936a7cf

GLENN JOHNSON, PhD, Volume II, 2-25-09

Page 499

1 Dr. Johnson, did you see a spatial analysis similar
2 to Exhibits 13 through 22 in Dr. Olsen's considered
3 materials produced in this case?

4 A Not that I recall.

5 Q Do you believe this to be a new spatial 03:22PM
6 analysis by Dr. Olsen?

7 MR. PAGE: Object to the form, speculation.

8 A It is a new figure, which I -- to the extent
9 that these have not been produced all in the same
10 figure before, I would imagine that would count as a 03:22PM
11 new analysis.

12 Q Dr. Johnson, based upon what you've seen today
13 in Exhibits 13 through 22 of Dr. Olsen's new spatial
14 analysis, does that new analysis render
15 scientifically valid in your opinion his 03:22PM
16 interpretation of the pattern that he sees in
17 Principal Component 1 scores above his threshold as
18 being consistent with poultry litter?

19 MR. PAGE: Object to the form.

20 A No. Can I put these away? 03:23PM

21 Q Yeah. Dr. Johnson, you were criticized at
22 various points in this deposition for not
23 characterizing and quantifying certain sources of
24 either phosphorus or bacteria in the Illinois River
25 watershed. Was that your role in this case? 03:23PM

GLENN JOHNSON, PhD, Volume II, 2-25-09

Page 500

1 A That is not what I was charged to do.

2 Q Okay. What were you charged to do?

3 A I was asked to review the principal component
4 analyses of Dr. Olsen and evaluate the degree to
5 which they supported or did not support his opinions
6 and conclusions.

03:23PM

7 Q In order to complete that analysis of Dr.
8 Olsen's principal component analysis, did that
9 require you in your opinion to have characterized,
10 inventoried and described the chemical composition
11 of all sources in the watershed?

03:23PM

12 A No.

13 Q Is it your understanding, Dr. Johnson, that
14 there are other members on the defense team who are
15 involved in source identification and
16 characterization?

03:24PM

17 A Yes.

18 Q And who are those people as best you know?

19 A Tim Sullivan and John Connolly. There may be
20 others, but I know those two.

03:24PM

21 Q And did I recall correctly from your testimony
22 yesterday that both of those individuals
23 participated in a review and discussion of your
24 expert report?

25 A Yes.

03:24PM

GLENN JOHNSON, PhD, Volume II, 2-25-09

Page 501

1 Q Okay, and at any point in time in those
2 conversations, Dr. Johnson, did either Drs. Connolly
3 or Sullivan suggest that your analysis was
4 inconsistent with the work that they were doing on
5 source identification?

03:24PM

6 A No, they did not.

7 Q Okay. Let me hand or hopefully you have in
8 front of you Exhibits 9 and 11 to your deposition.

9 A Okay.

10 Q Do you recall being asked questions based upon
11 a sentence or two, excerpts from Exhibit 9 titled
12 Evaluation of Graphical and Multivariate Statistical
13 Methods For Classification For Water Chemistry Data?

03:24PM

14 A Yes, I do.

15 Q And, Dr. Johnson, did you have an opportunity
16 to review the entire text of that article last
17 night?

03:25PM

18 A I still have not read it in the detail I would
19 if I was reviewing this as a paper, but I read it
20 and I spent more time on it than I was -- than I had
21 here yesterday.

03:25PM

22 Q And my understanding of the questioning
23 yesterday -- I want to know if it's consistent with
24 yours -- was that there was a suggestion that that
25 article supported Dr. Olsen's treatment and

03:25PM